

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

					_		
	APPLICATION NO.	FII	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	1
10/500,523		06/30/2004		Amos G Winter	WAG12-US	4349	
	24222	7590	06/01/2006		EXAMINER		
	MAINE & A	SMUS			COLETTA	COLETTA, LORI L	
	100 MAIN ST	reet					_
	P O BOX 3445			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
	N ATHIA N	H 0306	1-3445		3612		

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Asticus Occurrence	10/500,523	WINTER, AMOS G					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Lori L. Coletta	3612					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 Ma	arch 2006						
	action is non-final.						
		secution as to the merits is					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Glosed in accordance with the practice under the parte Quayle, 1900 C.D. 11, 400 C.G. 210.							
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) 1-9,12,14-19,21-33,37-40,42-49 and	52 is/are pending in the application	on.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>2-5,12,14-19,21-32,42-49 and 52</u> is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,6-9,33,37 and 38</u> is/are rejected.							
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>39 and 40</u> is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine		hu tha Cuanina					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 30 June 2004 is/are: a)							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:						
<u> </u>	· _						

Art Unit: 3612

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 33, 37 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Renaud 3,961,716.

Regarding claim 33, Renaud '716 discloses a motorized recreational vehicle (10) comprising a vehicle body of substantially unibody construction having front end, bottom, sidewalls, rear and top; a suspension system; an engine and drive train; a living compartment; and at least one storage compartment below the floor of the living compartment, at least a portion of said storage compartment configured as a garage accessible to at lest one automotive through an openable hatch disposed in said rear of said vehicle body.

Regarding claim 37, Renaud '716 discloses a motorized recreational vehicle (10) wherein said automobiles are chosen from the group of automobiles consisting of sub-compact cars, compact cars, midsize cars, sports cars, sport utility vehicles, light pick-up trucks, and full size cars.

Regarding claim 38, Renaud '716 discloses a motorized recreational vehicle (10) wherein said hatch is configured to act as a ramp and raised to a vertical orientation with the closing of said hatch.

Art Unit: 3612

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Renauld 3,961,716 in view of Forsyth et al 3, 933,258.

Regarding claim 1, Renaud '716 discloses a motorized recreational vehicle (10) with living space (14) and storage space (16) comprising a vehicle body of unibody construction having a front end, bottom, sidewalls, and top, and being further configured with an openable rear end and an access door proximate said front end, at least one rear wheel suspension system, at least one storage area disposed within said vehicle body, said storage area at least partially extending between said bottom and said floor structure, said storage area being accessible at least through said openable rear end.

However, Renaud '716 does not show at least one rear wheel suspension system comprising independently mounted first and second rear wheels, at least one storage area disposed between said first and said second rear wheels.

Forsyth et al. '258 teaches at least one rear wheel suspension system comprising independently mounted first and second rear wheels (23), at least one storage area disposed between said first and said second rear wheels.

Art Unit: 3612

Regarding claim 1, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the motorized recreational vehicle of Renaud '716 with at least one rear wheel suspension system comprising independently mounted first and second rear wheels, at least one storage area disposed between said first and said second rear wheels, as taught by Forsyth et al. '258, in order to provide a large wheel base for the motorized recreational vehicle.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Renauld 3,961,716 in view of Forsyth et al. 3,933,258 as applied to claim 7 above and further view of Wardavoir 5,393,094.

Regarding claim 6, Renauld '716, as modified, discloses a motorized recreational vehicle further comprising a driver's steering console at a driver's station connected to a steerable front wheel suspension system providing directional capability for said vehicle but does not show said drivers steering console being retractable from said driver's station when not in use.

Wardavoir '094 teaches said drivers steering console being retractable from the driver's station when not in use.

Regarding claim 6, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the motorized recreational vehicle of Renauld '716, as modified with a driver's steering wheel being retractable from the driver's station when not in use, as taught by Wardavoir '094, in order to move the steering wheel between a utilization position and a retracted position in which the steering column occupies a reduced volume of the vehicle passenger compartment.

5. Claims 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Renault 3,961,716 in view of Forsyth et al. 3,933,258 as applied to claim 1 above, and further view of Martin 6,135,532.

Regarding claim 7, Renauld '716, as modified, discloses a motorized recreational vehicle but does not show said storage area extending vertically upward behind said living compartment.

Martin '532 teaches a storage area extending vertically upward behind said living compartment.

Regarding claim 7, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the motorized recreational vehicle of Renauld '716, as modified, with a storage area extending vertically upward behind the living compartment, as taught by Martin '532, in order to provide a spacious storage area.

Regarding claim 9, Renauld '716, as twice modified, discloses a motorized recreational vehicle, comprising a rear end ramp extendible to ground level for delivering and removing a vehicle into and out of said storage area.

Art Unit: 3612

6. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Renault 3,961,716 in view of Forsyth et al. 3,933,258 and Martin 6,135,532 as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Johnson, Jr. 4,966,510.

Regarding claim 8, Renauld '716, as twice modified, discloses a motorized recreational vehicle but does not show said storage area comprising upper and lower levels within said storage area and a mechanism for elevating objects from ground level to said upper level.

Johnson, Jr. '510 teaches a storage area comprising upper and lower levels within the storage area and a mechanism for elevating objects from ground level to the upper level.

Regarding claim 8, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the motorized recreational vehicle of Renault '716, as twice modified, with a storage area comprising upper and lower levels within the storage area and a mechanism for elevating objects from ground level to the upper level, as taught by Johnson, Jr. '510, in order to support different types of loads on a wheeled vehicle during over the road travel.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 7. Claims 2-5, 12, 14-19, 21-32, 42-49 and 52 are allowed.
- 8. Claims 39 and 40 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Amendment

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 3612

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lori L. Coletta whose telephone number is 571-272-6658. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Dayoan can be reached on 571-272-6659. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lori L. Coletta Primary Examiner Art Unit 3612

llc May 26, 2006